

**MINUTES OF THE
STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR PUBLIC AND HIGHER
EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Sept 5, 2000 - 1:00 p.m.- Room 303 State Capitol

Members Present:

Sen. David H. Steele, Co-Chair
Rep. Lloyd Frandsen, Co-Chair
Sen. Joseph Hull
Sen. Howard Stephenson
Rep. Patrice Arent
Rep. Keele Johnson
Pat Eyre
Maria Farrington
Joyce Gray
David Greene
Jan Ferre'
Cecelia Foxley
Jill Kennedy
Steven O. Laing
Anthony Morgan
Dolores Riley
Phyllis Sorensen
Paul Sybrowsky

Members Absent:

Aileen Clyde
Stephen Ronnenkamp

Members Excused:

Val Finlayson
Sal Jansson
Con Rowley

Staff Present:

James L. Wilson,
Associate General Counsel
J. Wayne Lewis,
Research Analyst
Wendy L. Bangerter,
Legislative Secretary

1. Rep. Lloyd Frandsen called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

MOTION: Rep. Keele Johnson moved to approve the minutes of June 21, 2000. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. James Wilson made a progress report of the Task Force on Learning Standards and Accountability in Public Education, the Funding of Public Education Task Force, and the Applied Technology Education Task Force. He said Mr. George Emert and Mr. Pat Eyre are no longer serving on the Strategic Planning Committee for Public and Higher Education Committee. Sen. Steele recommended a plaque be given to retiring members who have served on the committee to recognize them and express appreciation for their service. Committee members concurred.

2. **Review of Master Planning**

Ms. Cecelia Foxley, Commissioner of Higher Education, was rescheduled to present the strategic plan for higher education at the next committee meeting.

Prior to reviewing the State Board's Strategic Plan for Public Education, Sen. Steele declared a conflict of interest as a representative of the State Office of Education and co-chairman of the Strategic Planning Committee for Public and Higher Education. Mr. Steven Laing, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, joined Sen. Steele in presenting public

education's strategic plan. The requirements for preparing a strategic planning report were reviewed by Sen. Steele and include: (1) promoting the mission of the systems of public and higher education; (2) addressing critical issues surrounding that mission and what is needed from the Legislature to empower its enactment; (3) conveying the objectives of the strategic plan and describing the means of accomplishing the goals; and (4) promoting performance measures. Sen. Steele said the characteristics of the state's public education system as outlined in Section 53A-1a-104 of the Utah Code include: (1) each student's capacity to learn, think, reason, and work; (2) a world-class curriculum; (3) an information retrieval system; (4) excellence in teachers; (5) empowerment of policy-makers; (6) parental participation; (7) the uses of technology; (8) research and development projects; (9) allowing choices for students and parents; and (10) the involvement of educators, parents and the community at large in the educational process. He said base funding increases for literacy, applied technology, quality educators, and accountability that improves instruction will be the main focus of the State Board of Education for 2000-2001. The State Office of Education prepared the following recommendations to implement the board's strategic plan.

- (1) The Utah State Office of Education will emphasize academic achievement for all students at all levels. Significant improvement will be achieved through supporting training and providing advocacy and funding distribution to all of public education;
- (2) The State Office will assist Utah schools who take full advantage of extended learning schedules (extended day, summer school, night school, etc.) to enhance student learning opportunities;
- (3) The State Office will focus on the funding and resources required to adequately address the needs of all students;
- (4) The State Office will assist and support developmental efforts for teachers and principals at all levels; and
- (5) The State Office will support the concept of literacy as fundamental to all learning and as part of the professional responsibility of all teachers and principals.

Mr. Laing emphasized the importance of collaborating with other education policymakers in order to realize the goals set by the State Board of Education. He said the State Board has the authority to prepare a strategic plan; but is unable to implement the plan by itself, since that responsibility is shared with the legislature, business, and higher education.

The committee commented on the strategic plan presentation and commended the board for its efforts. The committee was encouraged that it had been unnecessary to lower teacher standards to accommodate for a shortage of teachers. It was pleased the board was striving to make assessment results available to teachers earlier so they could use the data in developing lesson plans, and that the board has continued to focus on literacy at all levels of education. The committee felt a new funding source needs to be identified.

Rep. Johnson felt that each teacher in the state should review the strategic plan and be aware of the planning efforts of the State Board of Education. He suggested that every teacher in the state with an e-mail address should be sent strategic planning information.

MOTION: Sen. Steele moved that the committee accept and endorse the report. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Comprehensive Plan for Teacher Quality - Proposed Legislation

Mr. Gary Carlston, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Ms. Teddi Safman, Associate Commissioner of Higher Education, presented a comprehensive plan for monitoring and sustaining teacher quality. Ms. Safman felt that all policy elements comprising teacher quality should be compiled into a comprehensive plan and be given a commitment for long-term resource support. She and Mr. Carlston reviewed research-based best practices for quality teaching. They distributed and discussed data about recruitment, preservice, licensure, induction, and teacher professional development. Ms. Safman said teacher quality is the foundation of all student achievement.

Mr. Carlston said the purpose for developing a comprehensive teacher quality policy includes: strengthening student achievement, statutorily recognizing teaching as a profession, committing to an adequate supply of well-prepared and qualified teachers; supporting high standards teacher preparation programs; identifying induction and professional development programs as long-term priorities; committing to recruit and develop key educational leadership; and establishing a partnership with the State Board of Education, the State Board of Regents, local school boards and the Legislature.

Mr. Carlston and Ms. Safman emphasized the need of long-term financial support for a comprehensive policy for teacher quality that would make it feasible to support annual supply and demand studies and educational technology initiatives in K-16. Mr. Carlston noted that a substantial amount of current law on teacher quality is within the Utah Code, but it is fragmented and would be more useful if consolidated or linked together into a comprehensive plan.

Ms. Safman explained that the State Board Educator Development Advisory Committee charged an ad hoc committee to recommend strategies that teacher preparation institutions could use to enhance teacher performance based on NCATE standards. Mr. Carlston and Ms. Safman recommended testing teacher competency during the first year of employment. Those who are unable to pass the exam would enroll in a remediation program as a condition of licensure. They emphasized the importance of alternative routes to teaching and noted that an alternate route is now available, but it is unable to meet current teacher supply and demand needs. A conscientious program of recruitment and training is needed first. They felt the first assignment of a beginning teacher must be carefully considered so the teacher is given an appropriate instructional load with sufficient time to prepare for classes and work with a mentor. The benefits of a National Board Certification was noted. They said the local educational community could do a great deal to

encourage national certification. Mr. Carlston and Ms. Safman reviewed the following four recommendations previously presented to the Legislative Education Interim Committee:

1. Endorsing long-term commitments to teacher quality and student achievement;
2. Reorganizing the Utah Code to reflect a comprehensive teacher quality policy;
3. Receive commitments from the State Board of Education, State Board of Regents, the state's 40 school districts, and the Legislature to collaborate and strengthen student achievement, and then be held accountable to one another and to the public; and
4. Continuing the Education Development Advisory Committee's collaborative efforts to strengthen teacher quality.

Mr. Carlston and Ms. Safman explained that states with high student achievement have raised teacher salaries, raised standards, paid for national board certification, have a strong induction program, and require mandatory professional development. Mr. Carlston said the number of teachers needed over the next five to ten years has been calculated by licensure and geographic area. The State Board is coordinating with Utah universities in considering applications for teaching programs and the number of teachers employed in Utah public schools after graduation. Mr. Carlston emphasized that these concerns are ongoing.

Sen. Steele introduced proposed legislation entitled "Teacher Quality Amendments," and reviewed the essential components of the bill relating to student achievement and teacher quality. He highlighted terms used consistently in discussing quality and achievement. He emphasized the concept of continued professional development as the driving force to enhance the education environment. He felt the committee needed to address three issues: (1) Should the Legislature statutorily adopt policy establishing the difference professional development can make in the quality of education? (2) What are the components of professional development? and, (3) If licensure and other requirements are included in legislation to ensure that professional development occurs, can they be consolidated into one policy? Rep. Frandsen suggested the committee express its views, questions, concerns, and possible solutions to the chairs via e-mail and on an electronic bulletin board before meeting again and taking action on the proposed legislation. Mr. Jim Wilson noted that professional development and licensure are the two key provisions of the bill and both concepts recognize teaching as a profession.

4. Additional Committee Business

Rep. Frandsen announced the next meeting will be held November 9, 2000 at 1:00 p.m.

5. Adjournment

MOTION: Rep. Johnson moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.